United Nations E/ICEF/2018/5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
11 December 2017
English
Original: Arabic/Chinese/English/French/Russian/Spanish

For decision

United Nations Children's Fund
Executive Board
First regular session 2018
6–8 February 2018
Item 9 of the provisional agenda*

Management response to the UNICEF evaluation synthesis report

Towards improved emergency responses: synthesis of UNICEF evaluations of humanitarian action 2010–2016

Summary

UNICEF welcomes the synthesis of UNICEF evaluations of humanitarian action 2010–2016 as an opportunity to take stock of priority issues emerging from evaluations over the past five years, as a critical reference that fed into both the development of the Strategic Plan, 2018–2021 and related efforts to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of UNICEF humanitarian action. The synthesis serves to further focus and provide an important overview perspective to change processes that have been already triggered by individual humanitarian evaluations and their management responses.

The synthesis highlights a number of issues that have been fully embraced in the new Strategic Plan: (a) strengthening connectedness and coherence between humanitarian action and development programming, with humanitarian response strategy more systematically anticipating recovery and connections to longer-term resilience, while development programming is more systematically risk-informed; (b) supporting a more systematic UNICEF and inter-agency collective approach to community engagement and accountability to affected people, putting people at the centre of humanitarian action; (c) contributing to stronger coordinated inter-agency needs assessment to guide humanitarian response planning that is relevant to evolving humanitarian needs; (d) strengthening results-based management, including planning and performance monitoring across humanitarian and development programming; and (e) maintaining and strengthening partnership with national and local humanitarian actors.

* E/ICEF/2018/1.

18-00336X (E) 090118

Please recycle

UNICEF acknowledges that the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) are not fully fit-for-purpose to guide UNICEF humanitarian action across the diversity of humanitarian situations, in particular for health emergencies, mass population movements and protracted crisis. UNICEF is committed to reviewing and updating the CCCs correspondingly. UNICEF is also committed to further reinforcing the implementation of its simplified procedures, especially in the context of Level 3 and Level 2 emergencies, to ensure faster, more effective delivery of at-scale humanitarian action.

Finally, UNICEF also recognizes the need to clarify and strengthen requirements for humanitarian evaluations to ensure more systematic and strategic evaluation coverage, including ensuring attention to different typologies of humanitarian response as well as producing evaluations that span both development and humanitarian programming; this will be addressed in the forthcoming revised evaluation policy of UNICEF.

The early findings of the synthesis significantly influenced the formulation of the Strategic Plan, 2018–2021, such that a number of recommendations have already been addressed through measures newly embedded in corporate commitments and reporting. The synthesis also serves as an updated baseline analysis of priorities for strengthening UNICEF humanitarian action. The analysis of priorities will be refined and updated as new humanitarian evaluations are undertaken.

Key evaluation recommendations and UNICEF management response

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
Evaluation recommendation 1: More stringent requirements to evaluate UNICEF has gathered a considerable body of evidence on its humanitarian action (76 evaluations since 2010). Its Evaluation Policy states that evaluations of humanitarian action will "usually be undertaken". Yet despite a set of corporate triggers, coverage remains unsystematic and patchy – particularly of Level 1 emergencies. **Management response: Agree**					
Action 1.1 UNICEF should consider setting more explicit triggers for its evaluation of humanitarian action. These should be explicitly defined by the Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) in discussion with the Evaluation Office. Potential dimensions could include: (a) spend (e.g., implementing the commitment in the present Evaluation Policy that an evaluation will usually be undertaken for a programme outcome results area of over $10 million); (b) duration of crisis (e.g., a two-year response); (c) strategic importance for the regional office; and (d) potential for wider lesson-learning for the organization.	**Agree** The Evaluation Office and EMOPS will define clearer triggers for humanitarian evaluation, taking into consideration the dimensions noted as well as the importance of evaluating humanitarian typologies that are less evaluated, and looking at the links between development and humanitarian programming. Reference to clearer triggers for humanitarian evaluation will be integrated in the forthcoming 2018 revised evaluation policy, which will be submitted to the UNICEF Executive Board for approval at its 2018 annual session.	Evaluation Office with EMOPS, Programme Division (PD)	2018 Q2	Under way	
Evaluation recommendation 2: Centralize needs in design Evaluations found that UNICEF's humanitarian action was often insufficiently grounded in needs assessments, even where these were feasible. Programme designs require clearer links to needs. **Management response** (See management response specific to each recommended action.) It is important to note that according to inter-agency guidance and as committed to by UNICEF and other partners, the needs assessment process should be coordinated and collaborative, impartial and fully transparent, led by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and with the involvement of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and national partners. All efforts by UNICEF to strengthen the linkage between programme design and needs assessment, including rolling needs assessment and inputs feedback by affected people and communities, depend upon progress towards this collective vision of needs assessment.					
Action 2.1 UNICEF's programme designs for humanitarian responses should be required to clearly map the intended pathways from needs to intended results, justify the choices made to test assumptions, and avoid supply-driven responses, placing people (and their evolving	**Agree** The UNICEF programme response should frame intended results (outputs) that correspond to needs as identified in common needs assessments coordinated by the HCT. UNICEF sector plans should support and align to inter-cluster and cluster strategies and plans. UNICEF programme commitments, as	EMOPS with the Field Results Group (FRG) and PD	2018 Q1	Under way	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section/s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
needs) firmly at the centre. This should be a fundamental part of programme guidance.	defined in the UNICEF Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, are adapted on the basis of identified needs and the capacities of partners. As a response evolves, needs should be reviewed periodically and programme design adjusted to evolving needs. All of the above is currently well-established in inter-agency and UNICEF programme guidance. (See the Inter-agency Standing Committee reference module for the implementation of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle[1] and the UNICEF Reference Document for Emergency Preparedness and Response). The refinement of needs assessment and more detailed planning must, however, be balanced with the need for quick response, as critical situations demand, and should not be undertaken at the expense of the immediate first wave of emergency response. **Action** To strengthen field practice further, UNICEF is expanding the corporate Results-Based Management (RBM) Learning Package by introducing more in-depth learning materials focusing on RBM in humanitarian action.				
Action 2.2 Performance monitoring strategies and plans for humanitarian action should clearly focus performance assessment on recording progress in responding to identified needs, and to measuring adaptation as needs change.	**Agree** It is essential to assess the performance of the overall humanitarian response in relation to both planned targets and evolving needs as the country office carries out a periodic review of progress. This periodic review of progress is important at the level of the specific agency, but even more so at the cluster and inter-cluster levels. However, in accordance with inter-agency guidance and practice, agency-specific performance tracking will continue to focus on targets that set out the expected UNICEF-specific contribution with implementing partners.	See 2.1	See 2.1	See 2.1	

[1] www.interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/hpc_reference_module_2015_final_.pdf

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section/s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
	Action As for 2.1, the above-mentioned refinements to guidance and learning materials will more clearly call for the periodic review of humanitarian response results in relation to both planned targets and identified and changing needs.				
Action 2.3 UNICEF should advocate, under the Grand Bargain process, for the humanitarian system to conduct lesson-learning on the experience of implementing needs assessments, including the challenges of the Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) approach, and the scope to invest in more detailed/granular needs assessments.	**Agree** **Action** On the basis of an exchange with other organizations, key activities have been identified under the Grand Bargain needs assessment work stream. Among these, UNICEF is advocating for the prioritization of the following three activities: (a) establishing a common inter-sectoral analysis framework (i.e., an analysis tree identifying key multi-sectoral data sets and aligning these to potential shared conclusions for needs analysis), including adaptations for sudden-onset and protracted emergencies, building upon existing guidance and tools with new adaptations (e.g., building upon the analytical framework in MIRA guidance, further developed by the Assessment Capacities Project and UNICEF-led clusters); (b) establishing structures (e.g., the Assessment Working Group under the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) and linked to national capacities/structures) and standard operating procedures at the national level to reinforce good practices in coordinated planning, implementation and the use of needs assessment by the HC/HCT, ICCG and clusters and the Cluster Lead Agencies; and (c) supporting links across humanitarian and development networks around data at the country level (e.g., between HCT Assessment Working Groups and the Common Country Assessment processes). UNICEF will advocate for the above-mentioned activities to be prioritized in the Grand	EMOPS	2017 Q4	Under way	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section/s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
	Bargain needs assessment work stream plan, which is expected to be consolidated by the end of 2017.				
Action 2.4 Under World Humanitarian Summit outcomes, Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) requires a more proactive, consistent and strategic approach. Meeting its commitments should be a fundamental requirement for all UNICEF's humanitarian action – not an added bonus.	**Agree** **Action** UNICEF country offices will be supported in applying a more systematic approach to putting people at the centre of humanitarian action, addressing community engagement, AAP and the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability[2]. Further, under its Strategic Plan, 2018–2021, UNICEF has established organizational targets that set an important basis for effective AAP mechanisms: communication for development, programming for community engagement and behaviour change at scale and establishing real-time information innovations at scale. Planned actions also include:				
	2.4.1 Webinars for regional and country offices on core concepts; strengths and weaknesses of current experience; and available support mechanisms;	EMOPS with PD	2017 Q3-4	Under way	
	2.4.2 Development and roll-out of learning materials targeting planning and monitoring and evaluation staff;	as above	2018 Q1	Under way	
	2.4.3 As a support to the inter-agency Communication and Community Engagement Initiative, the development of standby partnerships and surge capacity to support country offices in implementing collective approaches to community engagement and accountability mechanisms;	as above	2018 Q2	Under way	
	2.4.4 The launch of an inter-agency knowledge resource platform (guidance, tools, good practice).	as above	2018 Q2	Under way	
Evaluation recommendation 3: Build a culture of confidence in procedures					

[2] Available from www.corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
Given its highly decentralized nature, guidance and procedures issued "from the centre" are only ever as influential as UNICEF's country management and staff habits permit them to be. New protocols and procedures, such as the Level 2 and 3 Simplified Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs), need to be accompanied by capacity development and training to build a "risk-willing" approach. **Management response: Agree** (See management response specific to each recommended action.)					
Action 3.1 **[3.1.1]** UNICEF should conduct training and awareness-raising of staff and partners on the importance of applying Level 2 and Level 3 SSOPs during humanitarian emergencies, and particularly commitments to speedy Programme Cooperation Agreement (PCA) processing.	**3.1.1 Agree** **Action** UNICEF will invest in a range of learning and dissemination strategies targeting staff as follows (see 3.2 regarding partners):				
	(a) Continued remote training through webinars for country office staff and consultants where Level 2 and Level 3 emergencies are declared;	EMOPS	2018 Q2	Under way	
	(b) Strengthening learning materials targeting senior leaders, regional networks and country offices on key pain points in SSOPs as identified in this synthesis, specifically on PCAs and human resources;	EMOPS	2018 Q2	Under way	
	(c) On the basis of the recent global review of civil society organization (CSO) partnerships, introduce initiatives to increase awareness on common practices and processes in all offices that are bottlenecks in the timely mobilization of partnerships.	ERG	2018 Q2	Under way	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
[3.1.2] Concurrently, management should explicitly confirm the requirement for their implementation as part of corporate procedures for humanitarian action.	**3.1.2 Agree** The SSOPs are firmly established in policy and procedures, and each new trigger of a Level 2 or Level 3 emergency starts with a communication from the Executive Director. UNICEF will refine the language in this standard communication to more explicitly confirm the requirement of SSOP implementation. Further and more importantly, UNICEF will focus upon learning, as mentioned above, and will continue to track the implementation of key simplified procedures for country office business processes for Level 2 and Level 3 emergencies through the existing Emergency Management Team monitoring tools (action tracker).	EMOPS	2018 Q1 and as above 3.1.1	Ongoing; no further action	
[3.1.3] Where relevant, all evaluations should assess whether these SSOPs have been implemented as required.	**3.1.3 Partially agree** Given that past evaluations assessing the SSOPs, including the synthesis addressed in this management response, have had difficulty in absorbing the breadth of the SSOPs, and given that the verification of their implementation would require a very granular analysis against procedures, a systematic, detailed review against SSOPs should not be the focus of all humanitarian evaluations. Depending upon the purpose and objectives of a given evaluation, specifically as related to the standard evaluation categories of efficiency, timeliness and effectiveness, elements of the SSOPs will be assessed. However, the detailed verification of performance against established procedures is rather the focus of audits.		N/A	No further action proposed	
Action 3.2 UNICEF should build awareness among its partners of its commitments to swift PCA processing under its Level 2 and 3 SSOPs. At the same time, it should clarify to partners the mechanisms by which they can hold UNICEF to account should these commitments not be met.	**Agree** UNICEF is committed both to the clear dissemination of its partnership agreement procedures and to the establishment of mechanisms to allow partners to track and hold UNICEF accountable for the implementation of those procedures. The UNICEF CSO Procedure and an accompanying guidance for CSOs are now publicly available on unicef.org. Both documents communicate clear timelines for establishing	FRG	2018 Q4	Under way	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
	partnerships and transferring funds. The CSO Procedure introduces a partnership review for partnerships of over $100,000 per year for two-way feedback on areas for improvement. An e-course on the CSO Procedure for UNICEF staff and CSO partners is under development and will be made available on Agora (UNICEF online learning platform). **Action** 3.2.1 The recent global review of CSO partnerships made several recommendations for improving CSO partnership management, including regarding: timelines for processing; the clear definition of targets; the monitoring of and reporting on progress; and partnership reviews. These findings will be used to drive global learning and discussions with CSO partners to identify strategies for improvement. 3.2.2 In line with the commitments made under the Grand Bargain, UNICEF is investing in technology to enable easier communication with partners as well as the more timely identification of partners and development of partnership agreements. In addition, the United Nations Partner Portal and eTools (both available by the end of 2018) will provide platforms for country offices to communicate with partners about expected processes and timelines and enable UNICEF and its partners to track progress.				

Evaluation Recommendation 4: Intensify the approach to risk-informed programming within the localization agenda
UNICEF's decentralized structure means that it benefits from a vast cadre of national staff and partners, which provide it with a core capability to prepare for humanitarian action from a localized viewpoint. Under Grand Bargain commitments, preparedness and risk identification should be approached from this perspective. Specific actions include (see table):

Management response: Partially agree (See management response specific to each recommended action.)
It is important to note that UNICEF invested over the course of its previous Strategic Plan (2014–2017) in strengthening a clear approach to risk-informed programming, including taking steps to integrate it within its results-based approach to programming. This supports country offices in identifying longer-term investments with partners to reduce and mitigate risks related to disasters, conflict, health emergencies, climate change and other shocks. Risk-informed programming includes disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and peacebuilding as well as strengthening national and local humanitarian response capacities. Similarly, UNICEF has invested heavily in strengthening emergency preparedness (shorter-term actions within a broader risk-informed programming): a new UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response was issued in December 2016, establishing more stringent Minimum Preparedness Actions (effective March 2018); a new

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section's*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
electronic platform (due in place by the end of 2017) to support country offices in carrying out and documenting preparedness as well as providing organizational oversight on preparedness. Under the Grand Bargain commitments, UNICEF has also made commitments to strengthen implementing partnerships with local humanitarian actors. Under the Strategic Plan, 2018–2021, UNICEF change strategies, enabling work processes and corresponding management performance indicators have integrated each of these dimensions; i.e., (a) risk-informed programming; (b) emergency preparedness; and (c) strengthening partnerships with national and local humanitarian actors.					
Action 4.1 Planning: All relevant country programme documents (CPDs) should explicitly integrate an analysis of political, fragility, climate and other potential risks, and assess the potential for reversion to emergency conditions. This implies accompanying the analysis with operational integration for the ability to flex if conditions require, as part of risk-informed programming.	**Agree** This is addressed in existing policy, procedures and guidance. As outlined in the UNICEF Programme, Policy and Procedure (PPP) Manual, country offices are required to carry out a risk analysis as part of their situation analysis, the first step in developing a new country programme, and must monitor the identified priority risks to children and women, updating their risk profile at least semi-annually (see UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response). The UNICEF PPP (revision forthcoming in 2018); the revised UNICEF Guidance on the Development of Programme Strategy Notes (2017); and the UNICEF Guidance on Risk Informed Programming (forthcoming 2018), all reinforce the importance of risk analysis. The Guidance on Risk Informed Programming, moreover, includes sectoral guidance to help staff to integrate adjustments to programming in terms of preparedness, mitigation and preventative actions. The set of Minimum Preparedness Actions established under the UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response also addresses key operational preparedness actions, including (a) the clarification of coordination roles and responsibilities in relation to Government and partners; (b) the establishment of clear internal responsibilities and relevant training (c) preparedness for staff reassignments and deployments; (d) supply and logistics planning; (e) preparations for cash-based interventions, as appropriate; and (f) partnership agreements with CSOs, as appropriate.	FRG	N/A	No further action proposed	UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response, 2016 (EMOPS/ PROCEDURE /2016/001). Preparedness for Emergency Response in UNICEF: Guidance Note 2016 Revised UNICEF Guidance on the Development of Programme Strategy Notes (2017)

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
Action 4.2 Local capacity building: UNICEF should build a cadre of "first responders" among partners at the country level, so that country programmes can flex from development to emergency action as conditions merit.	**Agree** UNICEF will invest in supporting systems strengthening, including but not limited to human capital (i.e., not limited to a focus on a "cadre" of first responders). This is well-captured in existing guidance on preparedness and partnerships (see 3.2.1).		N/A	No further action is proposed.	UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2018–2021
Action 4.3 Adaptive capacity: UNICEF should ensure that all PCAs include the scope for adaptation to emergency response, as part of preparedness.	**Disagree** UNICEF is committed to ensuring that partnership agreements include standing provisions for humanitarian response, as appropriate, but not in all partnerships. UNICEF enters into a wide range of partnerships with CSOs, which are established through PCAs. Not all partnerships bring added value to timely, efficient and effective humanitarian response. The UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response does require country offices to identify potential humanitarian partners and formalize agreements with key partners, as guided by the required risk analysis and the corresponding preparedness plan.		N/A	No further action is proposed.	UNICEF Procedure on Preparedness for Emergency Response, 2016
Evaluation Recommendation 5: Revisit the CCCs The CCCs in their current formulation do not reflect the changing nature of humanitarian crises, and promote siloed rather than integrated responses. They should be revisited. **Management response: Agree**					
Action 5.1 The CCCs could either be revised to reflect the new challenges of humanitarian crises, such as migration and health emergencies, whilst promoting multi-sector responses; or updated to include an addendum, which lists new challenges, sets integrated programming objectives, and supplies an accompanying monitoring framework.	**Agree** UNICEF will initiate an exercise to update the CCCs during the next office management plan time frame.	EMOPS	2018 Q4	Planned	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
Evaluation Recommendation 6: Accountability with flexibility Performance monitoring of humanitarian action is a consistent challenge, yet the evaluations analysed here found considerable scope to improve UNICEF's monitoring of its own performance in emergencies, in line with recent internal efforts to strengthen Humanitarian Performance Monitoring (HPM).[3] **Management response: Partially agree** (See management response specific to each recommended action.) In response to the review of the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Approach carried out in 2016, UNICEF has already begun introducing a significant shift in its approach to performance monitoring and, more broadly, results-based management for humanitarian action. The main thrusts of the revision are to (a) reinforce the coherence and connectedness between the planning and monitoring of development and humanitarian programming; (b) strengthen field monitoring, focussing on the quality of programming and including feedback from affected people and communities; and (c) support adaptations for different types of humanitarian crises, including protracted crises, health emergencies and migration and refugee crises. This entails revising guidance, tools and information management systems and rolling them out to country offices through training, remote technical support and direct technical support from headquarters and regional offices, as needed. Some of this has already begun; further refinements will follow from the work under action 5.1 to update the CCCs.					
Action 6.1 UNICEF should accelerate efforts to further integrate HPM with country-level monitoring systems, to ensure that indicators express both global information needs and local realities.	**Agree** These general principles have already been established in revised guidance on performance monitoring in humanitarian action (Results-Based Management Handbook: Working together for children and the updated Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Toolkit landing page). **Action** UNICEF will continue to revise its monitoring guidance to reflect the coherence and connections between programme monitoring for humanitarian action and for development response. Deliverables will include the final revisions to the PPP Manual (monitoring chapter); an integrated programme monitoring toolkit; and refinement of the guidance on indicators, integrating previous stand-alone humanitarian guidance with mainstream UNICEF guidance and aligning the consolidated guidance with the inter-agency humanitarian indicator registry.	EMOPS with PD, FRG	2018 Q2	Under way	Results-Based Management Handbook: Working together for children (2017) Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Toolkit landing page

[3] A full review of the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring (HPM) approach in 2016, included in the synthesis of non-evaluative work, found similarly that HPM is often seen as being too rigid, often separate from existing monitoring and evaluation systems at the country level, and not always offering appropriate indicators. Its recommendations are presently being actioned by UNICEF.

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
Action 6.2 Under its HPM approach, UNICEF should prioritize extending the range of outcome indicators available, to better reflect qualitative changes in conditions for affected populations as part of its accountability commitments.	**Partially agree** UNICEF does not consider a focus on "extending the range of outcome indicators available" as the way to either strengthen outcome monitoring or to better reflect qualitative changes in conditions for affected populations. UNICEF recognizes that its approach to performance monitoring needs to be strengthened to "better reflect qualitative changes in conditions for affected populations." In addition, UNICEF is working to strengthen collective outcome-level monitoring with partners. UNICEF sees this as an endeavour requiring wider partnership and investment in real-time information systems development and innovative methodologies adapted to very challenging contexts for data collection. This is part of an evolving area of work under the UNICEF data strategy for children over the course of the new Strategic Plan.				
	Action 6.2.1 As part of the UNICEF approach to AAP (see 2.4.2: Development and roll-out of learning materials targeting planning and monitoring and evaluation staff and 2.4.4: Launch an inter-agency knowledge resource platform), the organization will provide training and contribute to an inter-agency toolkit addressing, among other issues, mechanisms for feedback and complaints from affected populations as part of performance management systems. The roll-out of these learning materials and training is linked with that of learning materials focusing on RBM in humanitarian action, as mentioned in 2.1.	EMOPS with PD	2018 Q2	Under way	
	6.2.2 Similarly, UNICEF will finalize revised guidance on approaches to field monitoring for application in both development and humanitarian programming. This will provide a systematic approach to probing both the results for affected people in humanitarian situations and the way in which the affected people perceive those results.	ERG with EMOPS	2018 Q1	Under way	

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section/s*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
	6.2.3 UNICEF is carrying out the country-level mapping of data gaps and capacities, which will in turn inform multi-stakeholder costed action plans to strengthen data for children. Piloting includes work in several countries with ongoing humanitarian situations or frequent seasonal disasters. By the end of 2018, this is expected to lead to partnerships around shared data priorities and learning about the ways in which to address outcome-level data gaps in such contexts.	DRP	2018 Q4	Under way	
Evaluation recommendation 7: Link programme integration to recovery A more explicit and defined strategic overview within UNICEF's humanitarian action is needed, which is firmly geared to resilience and transition goals. This should be linked to the revisited CCCs, above. **Management response: Partially agree** (See management response specific to each recommended action.) It is important to note that the synthesis also identifies some external constraints in linking humanitarian action to longer-term recovery and resilience, specifically instances in which funding for recovery efforts post-crisis was lacking. UNICEF views this recommendation as intricately linked with efforts to strengthen multi-year planning and funding.					
Action 7.1 Collective planning needs to take place across programme areas, with multi-sector programming geared to the same intended goals of resilience and transition. Targets set should be high-level and overarching, rather than limited or sector-specific.	**Partially agree** UNICEF agrees with the importance of strengthening strategy development and planning processes to address longer-term goals of resilience. UNICEF would argue that formulating objectives and targets that link to longer-term resilience is needed at the level of both sector-specific objectives and high-level overarching cross-sector goals. The recommended multi-sector programming and high-level multi-sector targets also require links to inter-agency goals and objectives and, ideally, coherence across HCT processes and plans as well as links to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) processes and documents. **Action** UNICEF is addressing this through a number of ongoing processes and initiatives:				

Recommended action	*Action-specific management response*	*Responsible section's*	*Expected completion date*	*Actions taken and implementation stage*	*Supporting documents*
	7.1.1 Under the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2018–2021, the organization has included targets for establishing multi-year strategies and plans in protracted humanitarian crisis wherever multi-year humanitarian response plans (HRPs) have been established by HCTs . UNICEF will issue revised guidance to country offices to develop multi-year Humanitarian Action for Children appeals aligned with multi-year inter-agency HRPs; this guidance will draw upon lessons from recent evaluations and studies on multi-year humanitarian planning as well as consultations under the Grand Bargain multi-year planning and funding work stream.	EMOPS with PD	2017 Q4	Under way	
	7.1.2 As mentioned as part of its effort to strengthen RBM for humanitarian action (see actions 2.1, 2.4 and 6.2.1) and in line with those, UNICEF will include modules on humanitarian planning, with an emphasis on cross-sectoral strategies and the integration of shorter- and longer-term results. (This will be rolled out over the course of 2018 through a combination of globally led training activities, online self-directed learning options and regional- and country-level activities.)	EMOPS with PD	2018 Q1	Under way	
Action 7.2 Regional offices need to supply cross-sectoral, rather than programmatic, engagement with UNICEF country teams.	**Agree** It is a generally accepted good practice, where possible, for regional offices to coordinate cross-sector support missions to country offices. It is not possible in all circumstances, given the size of regions, the number of regional advisors and the competing time-bound support requirements of the country offices.		N/A	No further action is proposed.	
Action 7.3 UNICEF should better define its strategy for protracted emergencies, with a clear linkage to transition, below.	**Partially agree** While UNICEF needs to better define strategies for protracted humanitarian situations, there is not one strategy alone that is appropriate for all such situations; rather strategies must be context-specific. The [illegible] of the [illegible] greater clarity on commitments and strategies in protracted humanitarian situations. See recommendation 5.		N/A	See action 5.	

Recommended action	Management response	Responsible section(s)	Expected completion date	Actions taken and implementation stage	Supporting documents
Action 7.4 The need for integration of multi-hazard risk reduction and climate change adaptation guidance, recognition of [illegible] types, and the inevitable presence of protracted crises. All humanitarian responses should be designed and implemented with a clear view towards changing needs and evolving programme modalities, with transition becoming a central part of UNICEF's core humanitarian cycle and ethos.	**Partially agree** UNICEF agrees that all humanitarian responses should be designed and implemented with a clear view towards changing needs and evolving programme modalities, and with a view towards longer-term results. However, UNICEF does not see the development of another "plan" document as a viable solution; country offices are already engaged in the development of UNDAFs, HRPs and refugee response plans at the inter-agency level, and develop agency-specific CPDs, Programme Strategy Notes and workplans. Rather than creating new plans, UNICEF will strengthen and connect existing planning processes and tools that help country offices to see shorter-term and longer-term results as coherently connected, and to shift modalities as needed. The revised UNICEF guidance on the development of Programme Strategy Notes and the related quality assurance processes support country offices to articulate the connection between humanitarian response and longer-term outcomes. The forthcoming new Procedure on Country Office Work Planning explicitly establishes the requirement for country offices to manage and review workplans with a focus on humanitarian outcomes and outputs as well as on the coherence and connectedness between humanitarian and development results under common outcomes. The revised CCCs will address the connectedness and coherence between humanitarian and development programming. (See recommendation 5.) To strengthen its humanitarian response planning and its attention to strategy, including transition and resilience, UNICEF will pursue actions identified in the response to recommendation 7.1.		N/A	See actions 5.1 and 7.1. No further action is proposed.	